Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee,

I formally oppose the following 10 bills: SB 505, 506, 710, 897, 1071, 1076, 6162, 6251, 6595, 6598 being presented for hearing on the grounds that they would have little or no impact on career criminal's actions. Connecticut, by the Brady Scorecard, is rated 5th in the nation for having some of the most stringent gun laws. As strict as Connecticut is in its gun laws, unfortunately, those laws did nothing to protect the victims of Sandy Hook School. How are more laws added to the plethora of laws already in existence going to bolster the security of the Connecticut citizenry? After this tragedy, admittedly, our defense mechanisms are up, we feel like we have been let down, that we are vulnerable but we can't let these defense mechanisms distort reality, or cause us to project our fear of a reoccurrence onto an object and say that if we control the object, we control the root cause of our fear. That is just a form of denial. We are all dealing with rage over this inconceivable action; we all feel that we have been victimized, obviously some extremely more than others. None of us want to live under an umbrella of fear. We don't have to live in a state of fear. we can take action. That action needs to be forthcoming from a rationally thought out plan: a plan that is based upon facts, not emotion, not an overwhelming flood of anxiety. Emotions are very real, but emotions are not and should not be a substitute for intelligent, rational thought. Emotions should NOT be the basis for developing laws. Are we looking for security or are we looking for payback? Is this process one of severe discipline because someone needs to pay for this horrific action? Is punishing the law-abiding citizens of Connecticut with even more our laws going to fix anything? We in Connecticut who legally own guns for legitimate reasons want to contribute to the healing of our state, but NOT at the expense of becoming collateral victims to this horrific event. We know that some have made a conscious choice to oppose firearms ownership and self-defense. They know the facts and understand the consequences of their actions and will happily attempt to sacrifice innocent people to obtain their goals. We, who own guns legitimately for legitimate reasons, sincerely grieve over the losses of those young children and six adults at Sandy Hook School. We are parents and grandparents also. Many of us feel that in standing for our constitution and protecting the fundamental civil rights of the men and women of Connecticut to keep and bear arms for defense of their children, their families, their loved ones, them selves, and properties as well as the state as guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Connecticut must council the legislature to oppose these bills. Promoting these bills does not add value to the existing gun laws or increase the security of the Connecticut citizenry.

Thank you
Rickey P. Humpage
25 Boughton Road
Old Lyme CT 06371-1321
9, March 2013